



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of course the play ought not so to be taken—though to say this is to say, what is the fact, that the poet's selection of incident and allegorical material even in the Second Part fails to convey coherently and unequivocally any one, consistent, philosophical conception. The teaching of Goethe cannot so simply be read off from the actual behavior of his hero as can the teaching of Lucretius or Dante from their directly didactic and incomparably better unified poems. His dominant idea repeatedly disguised itself in the form of similar but essentially distinct ideas. Yet, of course, a dominant idea is there; and through it Goethe helped bring about a species of *Umwertung aller Werte* which most minds that have learned much from the past century's reflection have accepted, but to which Mr. Santayana seemingly remains irreconcilable. It consists of an apotheosis of the notion of becoming, of a conviction that the ultimate values of existence lie not in the goal but in the process and in the inner experiences which accompany it, of a hatred of that finality and *αἰράκεια* which, in one way or another, most Greek ethics conceived as the supreme good. These are matters about which philologists presumably do not much concern themselves, and they need not, therefore, be discussed here. But it is pertinent to point out that a conscious and reflective adoption of these 'romantic' ideals is quite a different thing from a childlike immersion in the "turbid flux of sense"—a fact which Mr. Santayana hardly sufficiently notes. To have the same sort of mystical feeling, and even austere devotion, towards "striving" and the *vereilender Wert* of every-day human experience that Dante had towards the timeless, incomprehensible abstraction of *l'eterno valore* (surely a far less rational thing to feel mystically about)—this is far from equivalent to being merely limited to "life in its immediacy." And it was this transfiguration of the immediate which was characteristic of Goethe, not the sort of simple-hearted restriction to the immediate which Mr. Santayana often seems to ascribe to him. The reader of much of the chapter on Goethe might easily suppose that poet to be characterized chiefly by a sort of barbaric *naïveté*. But, whatever else Goethe was, he was not *naïf*; nor is it through *naïveté* that the modern world has so

largely come to a certain way of thinking about the nature of good and the nature of things, which the author of *Faust* confusedly foreshadowed.

A. O. LOVEJOY.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

---

*Eructavit.* An Old French Metrical Paraphrase of Psalm XLIV, published from all the known manuscripts and attributed to Adam de Perseigne, by T. ATKINSON JENKINS. Dresden, Max Niemeyer, 1909. 8vo., xlv + 128 pp. (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, Band 20.)

In undertaking a critical edition of the old French poem *Eructavit*, Professor Jenkins has chosen a task which presents many difficulties. An anonymous work, containing a far-fetched exposition of the forty-fourth Psalm of the Vulgate, and possessing little literary value, it is interesting as one of the few literary texts written in the eastern dialect. But as not one of the fourteen manuscripts in which it is preserved was written in the original dialect of the author, a reconstruction of the text was the most important duty of an editor, and in this reconstruction Professor Jenkins has shown commendable judgment.

The poem affords only slight evidence of the date and place of writing. The allusions to "ma dame de Champagne" (v. 3) and to "la jantis suer le roi de France" (v. 2079) are beyond doubt addressed to that famous patroness of literature, Marie de Champagne, the sister of Philip Augustus (1179–1223). That the author was an ecclesiastic is a certainty, that he wrote the paraphrase when Marie was mourning for the death of her husband (1181) is made probable by the fact that the psalm on which it is based was used in church services not only on Christmas morning, as noted by the author (vv. 15 ff.), but also on the Festival of Mary Magdalene, the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, the Commemoration of the Virgin, and the Blessing of the Vestments of Widows, according to the Westminster Missal,<sup>1</sup> which was

<sup>1</sup> *Missale ad usum ecclesie Westmonasteriensis*, ed. J. W. Legg (Henry Bradshaw Society), fasc. I, 58; II, 873, 1096; III, 1322; II, 1208; III, 1671.

in all probability similar to that used in the entourage of a court which had such close relations with that of England. The editor has rejected (xi) with good reason the conjecture that because St. Pierre-le-Vif at Sens is mentioned in connection with the apostles to France, Savinian and Potentian, the writer was connected with that monastic foundation. The *Acta* of these twin saints—descendants of the Dioscuri—composed not earlier than the beginning of the eleventh century,<sup>1</sup> would have had its intended effect anywhere in the sees forming part of the archbishopric for whose benefit it was forged by the end of the twelfth century, in substituting their apostolate to France for that of St. Martin, found in the earliest apostolic catalogues. In following the *Acta*, one of the sources of the poem not considered by the editor, the author has not made other radical divergences from it. St. James still appears as the apostle to Syria (vv. 793-4); the tradition of his apostolate to Spain, due to a Spanish forger,<sup>2</sup> which was to play such a part in French epic poetry of the following century, is evidently quite unknown to him. But to attribute the poem to Adam de Perseigne is simply a conjecture. There is no internal evidence in its support, and if one considers the other testimony adduced it should be noted that the connection of Richard Cœur-de-Lion, the half-brother of Marie (xiv, xvi), could have only been official, when Adam is named "confessor noster" in two charters granted to the abbey of Perseigne in 1198 by the king,<sup>4</sup> as the latter is said by the Coggeshall Chronicle<sup>5</sup> not to have taken communion for seven years before his death in 1199.

In connection with the plea of the author for a more humane treatment of the Jews (x), it is to be noted that the legend of Isaiah's martyrdom by sawing, which was not so well known in the Middle Ages as is implied by Professor Jenkins (106), had a rabbinical source. The first part of the legend has a close verbal similarity to the

version in the *Historia scholastica*<sup>6</sup> of Petrus Comestor († 1179), which might well have been known to the French author, since as early as 1195 Hugh Pudsey, Bishop of Durham, left to the church of Durham an "Abbreviatio scholasticae Historiae."<sup>7</sup> But the *Historia* does not contain any suggestion of the episode told in the verses:

En cele angoisse ou il estoit  
Quant li soierre s'arestoit,  
Prist le prophete une granz sois;  
Mais por ce que li cuiverz rois  
Ne soffri qu'an li donast boivre,  
Deu commança a ramantoivre.  
Par cez paroles le proia  
Et Damedés li anvoia  
Un fil d'iaue devers le ciel,  
Sœf et douce come miel.  
Si tost comme il l'ot avalee  
Si en fu l'ame a Deu alee (2111-2122);

which evidently had as its source the anecdote given as a supplement to Comestor's account by Higden in his *Polychronicon*:

Tradunt Hebraei quod dum Isayas extra Jerusalem juxta fontem Siloae secaretur, petivit aquam sibi dari, qua non concessa, Deus de coelo misit aquam in os ejus, et sic expiravit.<sup>8</sup>

The ultimate authority for this anecdote was a Latin compilation, resembling in many respects the *Historia*, of which it was one of the main sources as it was of the biblical poem of Macé de la Charité<sup>9</sup> and of other works.<sup>10</sup> This compilation was probably written by a Christian in Champagne, where Troyes was the centre of Jewish rabbinical studies in the twelfth century,<sup>11</sup> and where, since the beginning of the same century, there had been friendly intercourse between Jew-

<sup>6</sup> Migne, *Patrol. lat.*, cxcviii, 1414.

<sup>7</sup> *Publications of the Surtees Society*, II, *Wills and Inventories*, 4. The earliest copy in a French collection is that entered in the catalogue of Corbie, made c. 1200 (Delisle, *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes*, S. 5, I, 506; on date see 395).

<sup>8</sup> Ed. Lumby, III, 76. The editor (xi) does not suggest its source.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. G. Paris, *Hist. litt. de la France*, xxviii, 209, 214.

<sup>10</sup> I have discussed at length in a study of another rabbinical story, found in Occidental literature, the contents, sources, and use made of this hypothetical work. It will appear in an early number of the *Zeit. f. rom. Philologie*.

<sup>11</sup> Renan and Neubauer, *Hist. litt.*, xxvii, 434-444, 475 ff., 482.

<sup>1</sup> L. Duchesne, *Bulletin critique*, XIII, 121 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Duchesne, *Annales du Midi*, XII, 145 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Cartulaire de l'abbaye Cistercienne de Perseigne*, 43, 81; cf. *Calendar of Documents Preserved in France*, etc., ed. J. H. Round, I, 363, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Ed. Stevenson, 96; cf. Ramsay, *The Angevin Empire*, 366, n. 1.

ish savants and the Christian clergy.<sup>12</sup> And it is better to attribute to this source the author's inspiration for making Isaiah the author of the *Gloria Patri*, than to the *Ascensio Isaiae*, which was unknown to the Occident for so many centuries.

In the study of the language (xxxv ff.) there are points which call for comment. It was a wise plan to follow the arrangement made by Foerster in the Introduction to the *Oliges*, but in speaking of the distinction between *e* and *ē* (6), so evident in the rhyme, it would have been better, instead of stating that it was contrary to Chrétien's usage, to note that the *Eructavit* is another text to be added to those noted by Foerster<sup>13</sup> as making this distinction. In *hom, hon*, 947, 1651, the word is a substantive, and *om, on* represents *ō*, while *an, en* represents *ē*, the indefinite *on* and the two sounds should not be treated under the same heading (4). The development of *e + J* into *oi* as well as into *i* is not so remarkable as the editor states (8, 16a), but is a common double development in the south-eastern French dialects. For the same reason, the statement (21): "As *e + i* > *i* it is reasonable to infer that tonic *proie*, *proient* presuppose pretonic *proier* (not *preier* nor *prier*)" is questionable. It is better to accept the evidence of different manuscripts which give the double development in which the pretonic forms whose endings are tonic have been formed on analogy with the stem-accented forms.

More noteworthy than *ou* for *o* in A (11) is the development of an *i* before a palatal in *touiche* and *bouiche*, a peculiarity which also appears in *boiche* and *toiche* of E. *Fuer : cuer : defuer* by the side of *fors* (17) is too general a phenomenon to be noted as a dialectic peculiarity. The cause of the rhyme *cuide : homicide* (18) might be mentioned: the shifting of the accent to the second part of the diphthong. The rhymes *fil : peril : fil : essil* are noticeable, as elsewhere *l'* rhymes only with itself.

Upon the difference between the cithara and the psalterium and their symbolism in the church fathers, the editor (p. 97) has failed to use an

informing note in van Hamel's edition of *Les Lamentations de Matheolus*.<sup>14</sup> For further confirmation of Professor Jenkins's conjecture (99; *Romania*, xxxix, 83-6) that the author's use of *melite* (Malta) with the sense "place of safety," "salvation from sin," was a reminiscence of the second book of the *De actibus apostolorum* of Arator, one has only to remember that this work was held up as a model of Christian composition, praised or pilfered from by a succession of writers, beginning with Fortunatus and ending with Roger Bacon.<sup>15</sup> Copies of it were very common in medieval libraries,<sup>16</sup> where it was sometimes found separate,<sup>17</sup> sometimes together with other Christian poets, Prudentius, Sedulius, Prosper and Juvenecus;<sup>18</sup> and more rarely with primary books of instruction such as Cato, Avianus and Theodulus.<sup>19</sup> Its appearance in such collections as at least the latter is explained by the oft-repeated commendation of its use as a textbook, which was first given it in the twelfth century, the date also of glosses on it, probably written in France, where it was most generally known.<sup>20</sup> If several copies of the work are found in some monastic libraries,<sup>21</sup> it was because they were doubtless loaned as copies of other elementary school books to the students of the monastic school.<sup>22</sup> Manitius's observation that

<sup>14</sup> Vol. II, 154-5, 263.

<sup>15</sup> M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, I, 166-7, 190, 349, 424, 509, 580, 602, 618; cf. Ebert, *Lit. d. Mittelalters*, II, 70, n., 132; III, 115, 498, n.

<sup>16</sup> Manitius, 167.

<sup>17</sup> G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui*, 3, 41, 52, 131, 138, 141, 142, 152, 174, 175, 186, 192, 197, 208, 227, 229, 242, 252, 275.

<sup>18</sup> Becker, *op. cit.*, 13, 28, 76, 81, 131, 134, 152, 191, 203, 249; M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, 42, 367, 487.

<sup>19</sup> Becker, 62, 70, 249; Hamilton, *Modern Philology*, VII, 178.

<sup>20</sup> Manitius, 167. That the third book of the *Labyrinthus* in which the work of Arator is commended as a school-book (59-60) was not due to the authorship of Evrard de Béthune (Manitius, l. c.; Jenkins, *Rom.*, xxxix, 84, n.) has been pointed out a number of times (Hamilton, *op. cit.*, 176).

<sup>21</sup> Becker, *op. cit.*, 128; James, *op. cit.*, 9, 364.

<sup>22</sup> Ingulphus, *Historia Croylandensis* in Gale, *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptorum Veterum*, Tom. 1, 104-5: "Pro minoribus autem libris, scilicet Psalteriis, Donatis, Catenis, et similibus Poeticis, ac quaternis de Cantu ad pueros et cognatos Monachorum accomodandis etiam

<sup>12</sup> D. Kaufmann, *Jubelschrift zum 90. Geburtstag des Dr. L. Zunz*, 147 ff.; *Rev. des études juives*, XVIII, 131-3.

<sup>13</sup> *Zeit. f. rom. Philologie*, xxviii, 508; and now xxxv, 477, n. 3.

outside of the episcopal libraries, copies were generally to be found in Benedictine cloisters, almost never in the foundation of the Cistercian and other orders, is an indication of the status of the author, useless as a criterion in the case of Adam de Perseigne, who was a Benedictine before becoming a Cistercian. Longinus is not mentioned in *John*, xix, 34 (101), and since the editor has credited his author with an acquaintance with the *Evangelium Nicodemi* (xxii-xxiii, 98), why has he not found the source of the two verses (1249-1250):

Quant il atocha au costé  
Dont Longis ot le fer osté

in the verses of the apocryphal work, "Accipiens autem Longinus miles lanceam aperuit latus eius,"<sup>23</sup> although the name "Longis" and the legend in regard to it were very common in medieval French literature.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

Cornell University.

---

JOSEPH WIEHR, *Hebbel und Ibsen in ihren Anschauungen verglichen*. Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania. Stuttgart, 1908. 183 pp., 8°.

This thesis seeks to compare the ethical, sociological, and psychological views of Ibsen and Hebbel as the author gathers them from the dramas of both poets and from the diaries and letters of Hebbel. The rich Ibsen "Nachlasz"

Cantori et Custodi almariorum cuicumque prohibemus districtius sub inobedientiae poena ne saltem sine licentia Prioris ultra unum diem alicui accommodentur aut tradantur." This passage only appears in this edition of a chronicle, of which the authenticity is more than dubious. It is not found in the only extant manuscript, which was the source of Savile's and Birch's editions (see *Rer. Angl. Scriptores post Bedam*, MDXCVI, fol. 519 vers.), as has been pointed out to me by my friend Professor E. K. Rand. The passage has not been traced to its source, nor has an analogous monastic practise been noted (J. W. Clark, *Care of Books*, 64-75), but it has an independent value as denoting the contemporary practise of the fifteenth century, when the forgery was written.

<sup>23</sup> Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha*, 2d. ed., p. 362.

which has modified our views of the poet considerably had not at the time appeared. Under the headings of Weltanschauung; Stellung zur Religion; Sittlichkeit; Staat, Gesellschaft, Individuum; Die Frau und die Ehe, he seeks to formulate the affinities and divergences of these two great thinkers and writers of the nineteenth century. Verbosity and a strong and annoying tendency to irrelevance frequently cloud the issue. The conclusion, as stated in general terms is: "In den Anschauungen Hebbels und Ibsens finden wir eine weitgehende Uebereinstimmung, doch wo dieselbe fehlt, treffen wir in der Regel auf einen absoluten Gegensatz" (p. 174). W. shows that basically the view of life of the two dramatists is identical: a conception of a dualistic world, in which a continual struggle is being waged between the "All" and the individual (pp. 25 ff.). Both looked upon the present state of society pessimistically, but hoped for a betterment of conditions in the future. They differed radically, however, in the method of procedure. This in Ibsen's case was a revolutionary attack on social conditions, which he depicted as unmitigatedly wrong and in need of immediate change. Hebbel, on the other hand, from the vantage ground of his "zauberkräftige Formel" (p. 8), saw the cause and justification of both the convention and the attack. Confusing in this connection is W.'s statement (p. 20) "dasz er (Hebbel) soziale Umstände nicht als berechnigte Gegenmacht ansieht," a cryptic remark not substantiated by any examples. Moreover, W. goes too far when he says: "Ibsen war selbst zu sehr Partei und stellte sich, wenigstens in seinen sozialen Dramen, mit Entschiedenheit auf die Seite der Gegner des Bestehenden" (p. 65). Ibsen criticises not only the social conventions which are the object of attack but also the critics who attack them. And if we may well say with W. that Hebbel "es zuwege brachte, allen Parteien recht zu geben" (p. 65), we may say of Ibsen that he shows all sides to be in the wrong. W.'s failure to perceive this leads him into unnecessary and wearisome disquisitions on the fallacies of Nora, Helene Alving, etc., whom he seems to regard as Ibsen's ideals of what human beings should be. A study of Anzengruber's *Pfarrer von Kirchfeld* might have shown W. the differ-